



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Classical Weekly

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XII

NEW YORK, MARCH 31, 1919

No. 21

PRESIDENT BUTLER ON EDUCATION AFTER THE WAR

In the Educational Review for January last (57.64-79) is printed an address entitled Education After the War, which was delivered by President Butler before The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, at Princeton, on November 29 last. The address makes refreshing reading. In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 12.17 I allowed myself to refer to Mr. H. G. Wells as "our universal world-instructor". Of Mr. Wells President Butler says that his "zeal for the lengthy discussion of education appears to be in inverse ratio to his acquaintance with some features of it". Classicists, at any rate, will read with satisfaction the following paragraph (65-66):

Part of what we have been living thru and putting up with as best we could, has been due to a false psychology and part to a crude economics. The moral and spiritual values have been ground between the upper and nether millstones of a psychology without a soul and an economics with no vision beyond material gain. Most of the old and exploded fallacies of by-gone centuries have been solemnly paraded before us in the trappings of new and highly important discoveries. We have been asked to doff our hats in salute to illusions of one sort and another that the world of intelligence found good reason to class as such long ago. Discipline was solemnly pronounced to be not only unnecessary, but impossible, altho a hundred little disciplines are right enough. A general education or training—which goes back to the time when Socrates pointed out to Hippocrates the distinction between *ἐπὶ Παιδείᾳ* and *ἐπὶ Τέχνῃ*—has been shouldered aside, not because it has not been justified by centuries of experience but because it is not deemed sufficiently materialistic or gain-producing to be recognized as part of an educational theory that is strictly up to date. According to this newest philosophy, no such admirable virtue as thrift, for example, could be taught, but only the saving of ten-cent pieces or of dollar bills, or possibly of Liberty Bonds, as separate arts or vocations! Industry, honesty, loyalty, charity and truthfulness have been ingenuously referred to as vague notions or catch-words that are very apt to delude the unwary—the unwary being probably the unselfish. A sense of humor or a flash of common sense, had either been present, might have saved us from being obliged to listen to all this and to contemplate the ideal world as made up of highly competent apple-polishers and pencil-sharpeners early trained to their engrossing tasks, and vocationally guided to be loyal and charitable to themselves alone.

On pages 67-68 President Butler insists that the great war has taught us to avoid Germany, absolutely, as a guide in educational matters, and to cling to those principles and purposes that have made France and Great Britain and the United States. To make pro-

gress toward the reestablishment of truer values and sounder processes in American education we must first of all define education, and determine what knowledge is of most worth (68).

If we would hearken to those who have just now been urgently asking to guide us, we should have to say that education is apparently the art of conducting the human mind from an infantile void to an adolescent vacuum, due emphasis being laid upon self-interest while the transition is going on. Perhaps, however, we should do better to insist that education is a process of body-building, spirit-building and institution-building, in which process skilful and well-interpreted use is made of the recorded experience of the human race, of the capacities, tastes and ambitions of the individual, and of the problems and circumstances of the world in which he at the moment lives. The purpose of this body-building, spirit-building and institution-building is not simply to strengthen and perpetuate what others have found to be useful and good, but rather by building upon that to carry both the individual and the race farther forward in their progress toward fuller self-expression and more complete self-realization. To attempt to turn education into a merely mechanical process, with a purely gainful end, is nothing short of treason to the highest, most uplifting, and most enduring human interests.

There are three fundamental aspects of civilization that have continuing and permanent significance (69).

These fundamental aspects are Ethics, the doctrine of conduct and service; Economics, the doctrine of gainful occupation; and Politics, the doctrine of reconciliation between the two and of living together in harmony and helpfulness.

These three aspects are then discussed on pages 69-70. In the future, continues President Butler (70 ff.), the care and protection of the public health will assume new importance. "The physician and the nurse will shortly be looked upon as educational factors quite as important as the teacher himself". Much more attention will be paid to the determination of individual differences of taste and capacity, and to making provision for them. On pages 71-75 President Butler then condemns, in unmeasured terms, the teaching in School and College of the natural sciences, of foreign languages (ancient and modern), of English language and literature, especially of composition work, and of government and politics. He thinks (73) that

Greek and Latin have been in large degree asphyxiated by wholly wrong-headed methods of teaching, and French and German are a sad spectacle to look upon.

He reiterates, what he has said before in his Annual Reports as President of Columbia University, that

The purpose in studying a <modern> foreign language is to gain sufficient practical mastery of it for use in daily intercourse, and so to obtain some comprehension of the life, the institutions and the modes of thought of the people whose language it is. French is not only the universal language of diplomacy but it is the common link between educated men and women the world over. It is of the first importance that American schools and colleges should teach French, teach it practically and in the spirit and for the purpose that have just been described. The teaching of Spanish, of Italian and of German will naturally be for similar purposes and on similar lines.

Let us hope that President Butler is right in the prophetic part of the following paragraph (75-76):

The swing of the pendulum away from interest in the ancient classics has plainly come to its end. There are many signs that a deeper insight and a wider sympathy are manifesting themselves, and that during the next generation the classical languages and literatures will be more earnestly pursued and better taught than they have been in the recent past. It is not practicable to use the classics directly in any plan of widespread popular elementary and secondary education, but it is entirely practicable for that education to be carried on with full appreciation of the importance of the classics and with full understanding of the lessons which they teach and of the standards which they set up. The classics remain the unexhausted and inexhaustible fountains of excellence in all that pertains to letters, to art and to the intellectual life. The secondary schools and the colleges must make adequate provision for their study and their proper teaching. Those in whose keeping the classics are placed must fix their minds much more on matters of human interest, human conduct and human feeling, and much less on matters of technical linguistic accuracy and skill. C. K.

AN EARLY SOURCE OF CORRUPTION IN THE TEXT OF PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

All the manuscripts which preserve the beginning of the *Andria* give verses 51-54, part of the passage in which Simo narrates to his steward and confidant, Sosia, the events which have led up to the action of the play, thus:

nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis, Sosia,
liberius vivendi fuit potestas (nam antea
qui scire posses aut ingenium noscere,
dum aetas, metus, magister prohibebant?), . . .

At this point, according to the manuscripts, Sosia interrupts with *Itast*. According to this reading¹, verse 52 furnishes a grammatical conclusion to the preceding statement, although the logical conclusion of this thought is given below (56 ff.), *quod plerique omnes faciunt adulescentuli*, etc. Line 52, moreover, will not scan. For these reasons, Hermann, *Rheinisches Museum* 6 (1848), 444, dismissed the line as not genuine. In fact the phrase *liberius vivendi fuit potestas*, in sense an almost exact repetition of the line

above, is typical of the scholia of the earlier Roman commentators. The subsequent insertion of such a marginal note into the text is familiar.

No satisfactory explanation has ever been given for the presence of the word *Sosia*, which is clearly the foreign element in the reading, *nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis, Sosia, nam antea*, which results from the omission of the gloss.

It is the aim of this paper to show that the word *Sosia* was originally a character-indication giving the speaker of the words *nam . . . prohibebant*, and that *Itast* introduced the resumed narrative of Simo. We propose to read as follows:

SI. nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis—SO. Nam antea
qui scire posses aut ingenium noscere,
dum aetas, metus, magister prohibebant? SI. Itast.
quod plerique omnes faciunt adulescentuli, etc.

The fact that a youth, freed from the restraining influence of the paedagogus, might display hitherto unsuspected traits is perfectly apparent. This entire passage in the *Andria* seems almost reminiscent of the remonstrance of Pistoclerus to his former paedagogus, Bacchides 148, *Iam excessit mi aetas ex magisterio tuo*. Hence the expression of so commonplace a thought is not inappropriate to even plodding Sosia. He, like many others of similar disposition, prides himself on his acumen and allows almost no remark of his master to pass without a philosophical comment. His remarks are not usually brief; *teneo*, 86, (and *itast* here) is (are) the sole exception(s). The latter seems more appropriate to Simo, who is impatient of the interruption and eager to continue his narrative.

The corruption in the text undoubtedly occurred at an early period, for we know from the commentary of Donatus that the reading of our manuscripts was already current in the vulgate text of the fourth century A.D. Donatus cites the line in several lemmata which are regarded by Karstens as undeniably genuine; for the grammarian found difficulty in the superfluous use of *liberius*. The corruption, however, may be very much earlier than Donatus. Cicero quotes the words, *nam . . . ephebis*, in three places: *De Oratore* 2.326; *De Inventione* 1.33, 1.27. In the last named passage *Sosia* is included, and in inferior manuscripts the remainder of the sentence, *liberius . . . potestas*, is given. Since this second line is usually regarded as a later addition to the work of Cicero, introduced by some scribe who knew the text of Terence of his own day, it is omitted in most editions of the *De Inventione*. It is quite possible, however, that Cicero as well as Donatus knew our text and that we should include the vocative and the gloss in Cicero's quotations in *De Inventione* 1.27. At any rate, Victorinus, quoting Cicero in his *De Ciceronis Rhetorica* (Orelli, 56), also gives the vocative. Another commentator, Julius Victor, discussing, in his *De Arte Rhetorica* (Orelli, 244), the same passage, omits the word *Sosia*.

¹Some editors read *et* at the end of verse 51, making the next line coordinate and avoiding a twofold conclusion to a single idea. This reading is metrically possible, for a monosyllable ending, though rare, may occur in a senarius. There is, however, no manuscript authority for this reading, which is suggested by the text of Donatus, whose lemma begins *et liberius* in two of the four principal manuscripts. The *et* is omitted both by Wessner in the most recent edition and by Karstens. It is probably due to dittography, since the preceding comment closes with the word *ex*.